



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Some of his statements, however, are erroneous or doubtful. Thus in the first volume, the statement that Alfred founded the internal government of London (page 12), rests upon very meagre evidence, and the assertion that he established the system of frankpledge and that this system was carried further in the *Judicia Civitatis Lundoniæ* (page 14), is quite untenable. Our author says, on page 15, that the earliest mention of a gildhall in London occurs in these *Judicia*; but as a matter of fact, that document does not mention any gildhall. Is there any good authority for the statement, on page 27, that, according to Alfred's laws, the Witan were to meet in London twice a year for the purposes of legislation? We are informed, on page 60, that a man who underwent the water ordeal was declared innocent only in case "he sank to the bottom and was drowned"; but the contents of some of the early plea rolls indicate that a person might survive this test and be acquitted as innocent.

In dealing with the reign of Richard I, Dr. Sharpe would have found it profitable to make use of Mr. Round's essay on the mayoralty of London and of the introduction to Palgrave's *Rotuli Curie Regis*. Dr. Liebermann's valuable account of the *Leges Anglorum* throws much light on the relations of the Londoners to the Great Charter, but doubtless it was published after Dr. Sharpe's first volume had passed through the press.

The second volume extends to the year 1714; the third will complete the history of "London and the Kingdom," and will contain two Appendices, comprising a list of the city's representatives in Parliament from the earliest times and copies of important documents in the city's archives. I anticipate that these documents will be of considerable value.

CHARLES GROSS.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

*The Meaning of History and Other Historical Picces.* By FREDERIC HARRISON. New York, Macmillan & Co., 1894.—482 pp.

Shortly after the death of Professor Froude a few months ago, a strange rumor became current in the English and the American press that the Regius Professorship of Modern History at Oxford, the chair which had been filled in turn by Stubbs, by Freeman and by Froude, was to be filled by the appointment of Mr. Frederic Harrison. The rumor was a startling one: readers of Mr. Harrison's charming magazine articles failed to see in them any qualification for the

holding of the most famous historical chair in England; and the tutors who for many years past have been building up the school of modern history at Oxford must have felt a thrill of indignation at the suggestion that they were to have as their professorial colleague the writer who recently in the pages of the *Fortnightly Review* grossly misrepresented their ideals and criticised their methods. It would have been, indeed, little less than a disaster for the spirit of scientific historical study in England if Mr. Frederic Harrison had been selected by Lord Rosebery to succeed Froude. Fortunately the danger was averted — indeed the rumor itself may have been entirely baseless — and Professor Freeman's intimate friend and deputy professor, Mr. York Powell, has been, to the satisfaction of all who are acquainted with his wide knowledge, his broad sympathies and his magnetic personality, chosen to fill the vacant chair. But the mere fact that Mr. Harrison's name was mentioned gives an added interest to this volume of reprinted magazine articles, which contains more than one chapter explanatory of Mr. Harrison's attitude towards history.

Of the seventeen essays contained in this volume, only four treat of history in the broader sense; the others are brilliant studies of Rome and Athens, and Constantinople and Paris, centennial articles on the French Revolution, a survey of the thirteenth century, studies on the new conditions of London and Paris, an appeal for the protection and preservation of ancient buildings, and the famous attack on "Palæographic Purism," which originally appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* in 1886. Of these miscellaneous essays it is unnecessary to say anything at the present time; when originally published, they attracted considerable attention, like everything Mr. Harrison writes, from the vivacity of their style, and they are excellent examples of the thoughtful reflections of a man of letters who has in his time read much history of men and things. Particularly striking are the articles on Constantinople, which abound in novel views and effective comparisons; but even Mr. Harrison himself could hardly have set forth these articles as justifying the mention of his name for a professorship of history. It is only upon the first four articles in the volume that Mr. Harrison's friends could base his claims to rank as a historian, and that, not because the essays show any evidence of historical work done, but because they express certain views upon history in general which might be regarded as proofs of fitness to direct the work of others. These four essays are entitled, "The Use of History," "The Connection of History," "Some Great

Books of History," and "The History Schools: an Oxford Dialogue;" and in them can be found Mr. Harrison's conception of history, as well as an appreciation of the great historians of all time.

At the time when Mr. Harrison's name was being freely mentioned for the chair at Oxford the consensus of educated historical scholars opposed to his the name of Samuel Rawson Gardiner. It was an open secret that Mr. Gardiner might have had the professorship if he had desired it, and that he preferred to remain in scholarly seclusion in order to complete his history of the period of the Commonwealth in England. The two men were pitted against each other by partisans on either side, and they may be regarded as representing the two opposite schools. Mr. Harrison's brilliant survey of the whole domain of history, exhibited in a readiness to discourse upon ancient Egypt, upon the empires of the East, upon Greece and Rome, upon the Catholic church, upon the mediæval city, upon the French Revolution, contrasts markedly with Mr. Gardiner's sober concentration upon the history of England in the seventeenth century. Mr. Harrison's acute remarks upon the great historical writers of all ages, from Herodotus to Carlyle, showing as they do a quite exceptional knowledge of the secondary writers upon all periods, contrast as markedly with Mr. Gardiner's conscientious examination of primary authorities. Mr. Harrison stimulates the imagination by daring comparisons and vivid word-painting upon well-known facts, while Mr. Gardiner, by patient research, discovers and relates the actual sequence of events in the field of history which he has made his own. Two of the reprinted essays in the volume under review were originally addresses delivered before University Extension students at Oxford, and they seem admirably fitted for such an audience; whereas Mr. Gardiner's elaborate and impartial works need considerable education and training for their right understanding and even for their patient reading. It may easily be guessed that to Mr. Frederic Harrison Mr. Gardiner is the living type of the minute and careful research which he himself regards as a very small part of the work of the historian, and it goes without saying that Mr. Gardiner's books do not appear in the list of those which Mr. Harrison recommends to Extension students. Only once does Mr. Harrison mention Mr. Gardiner by name, and he twice alludes to him in different essays merely as a typical and most laborious scholar. Far above Gardiner does Mr. Harrison rank Carlyle as an historical writer. In spite of the famous Scotchman's wonderful capacity for making mistakes, in spite of his inability to weigh evidence, in spite of his utter lack of

any sense of historical proportion, in spite of the gross and often willful carelessness with which he deals with his authorities, Mr. Harrison persists in regarding Carlyle as an historian, and even goes so far as to recommend his books as histories. Carlyle's *Cromwell* is called "one of the most splendid monuments of historical genius," and a "masterpiece of industry and genius;" and the unfortunate reader of seventeenth century history in England is recommended to supplement it by a study of Guizot — of Guizot! of all people in the world — and of Green's *Short History of the English People*. And again, Carlyle's *French Revolution* is styled, "a great book," "an enduring book," and "the most striking extant example of the poetical method applied to history;" although in the same breath Mr. Harrison admits that "Carlyle has too often proved to be extravagant or unjust and sometimes flatly mistaken in his facts." It is indeed a blessing for the future historians of England that Mr. Harrison is to have no share in their training, when he holds such extraordinary views about the true province of history as to rank the most conspicuous offender against the canons of historical truth of the last hundred years among the greatest of great historians. As a corrective to the extravagant views avowed by Mr. Harrison upon this subject, a careful study may be recommended of the recent article upon the scientific study of history in the *Fortnightly Review* by Mr. H. A. L. Fisher, one of the most accomplished of the younger school of Oxford historical teachers.

In conclusion, although Mr. Harrison's views on history may be deprecated, and his accuracy suspected, since he deals with equal ease with so many different subjects and so many remote and unconnected periods, it would be unfair not to admit his skill as a writer, and not to recognize that "the man of letters who has read much history" can invest his work with more subtle charms of style than the laborious scholar who patiently pieces together the history of the past and is apt to lose in the examination of details the broad grasp and deep insight which alone can win immortal fame for a writer of history.

H. MORSE STEPHENS.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,  
ITHACA, N. Y.

*The Historical Development of the Jury System.* By MAXIMUS A. LESSER, A.M., LL.B. Rochester, N.Y., 1894. — 12mo, 274 pp.

What we most need in the field of English legal history is original work, based on careful study of the sources: work such as is being